

ORIG

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, May 7, 1982

Present: D. Taddeo, Chairman, R. Breen, R. Pallen, M. Singer, J. Princz, R. Martin, A. Sharma, C. Campbell, S. Casey, B. Lewis, R. Diubaldo, J. Doyle, L. Hughes, C. Kalman, K. Kusano, C. Langford, J. Lightstone, J. Macaluso, D. McDougall, S. McEvenue, B. Petrie, H. Proppe, K. Riener, A. Ross, J. Ryan, B. Sahni, M. Shames, M. Squires, D. Dicks, A. Megann, M. Padowicz, K. Macdonald, G. Murray, S. Méthot.

Absent with regrets: C. Bertrand, K. Bindon, H. Fink, O. Schwelb.

Guests: A. Broes (English), J. Herz, J. Drysdale.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

82-6-1 It was moved and seconded (Langford/Sahni) to approve the agenda.
Vote: Carried

3. The Vice-Rector's Remarks

Dean Taddeo informed the meeting of Faculty Council that Vice-Rector Breen had requested the opportunity to speak on a number of issues.

Dr. Breen first reported on the significant drop in enrolment which had resulted from the increase in international student fees; he urged faculty to respond positively to an upcoming appeal for funds

to supplement monies being made available to foreign students caught in mid-programme.

Dr. Breen then reviewed the growth of the Concordia student population during the last five years. Referring to "Faculty of Arts and Science Student Statistics 1977/78 to 1981/82" (ASFC 82-7-D7) which was distributed at the meeting, he reviewed the departmental impact of the Faculty's 17% decline in enrolment during the last five years. He also outlined demographic projections for the next twenty years and addressed the desirability and feasibility of significantly increasing the number of Concordia's francophone students. He noted the apparently inevitable decline in foreign students.

Dr. Breen next outlined his view of the long-term future of the Concordia Arts and Science Faculty. Particularly in light of the proliferation of part-time higher education across the province, he emphasized the need for the Faculty to develop a unique character which would distinguish it from other Quebec universities. He isolated four facets of uniqueness which the Faculty should pursue: continuing to develop excellence despite limited resources; elaboration of a core curriculum; the further development of the colleges, and the implementation of co-operative education. He promised to play an active role in developing these four characteristics.

Dr. Breen briefly described the new Quebec budget formula. For every new student coming to Concordia (over and above those we have at the present time) we will be given 75% of the system costs, which is higher than the per capita grant which we now receive; for every student that we lose, we will lose 3/4 of the university costs. Under these circumstances, he stressed the need to increase enrolment for 1981-82, even if extra course sections are required.

Finally, Dr. Breen reiterated the University's willingness to consider the retraining of faculty in order that they might move from under-enrolled areas to fields which are obviously understaffed.

Dr. Breen looked forward to a very successful year but indicated that it would require the collaboration of administrators, department chairmen, faculty and students.

Dr. Taddeo thanked the Vice-Rector for his remarks.

Provost Singer said that he appreciated the remarks made by the Vice-Rector. He thought that it would be more appropriate, in the future, if such remarks were included as an agenda item so that members of Council who wished to be present could make a special effort to attend.

Dr. Taddeo replied that the statement was well taken.

4. Questions and Announcements

Dean Taddeo reported that there were two seats available on the Board of Governors for members of the Faculty of Arts and Science and that a letter would go out shortly inviting nominations for the positions. He asked the members of Council to pay close attention to the process: to make nominations and to participate in the elections which would take place subsequently.

The Chairman noted that in January 1980 the Faculty of Arts and Science approved a Master's in Media Studies in principle and asked that it come back to Council if there were budgetary implications. He said that the dossier was forwarded to the Board of Graduate Studies, and subsequently to the Comité d'évaluation, Comité des fonctions and the Conseil des universités. Along with the proposal there was a request for two positions to staff the area of media management and research methodology. The Conseil, through its two committees, rendered a very favourable 'avis' saying that the programme was a quality programme, an original programme complementary to other programmes, and built upon a strong tradition of excellence which Concordia has in the area of communication studies. Implementation of the programme was approved in 1981 but the money needed was not supplied. At that time the Ministry of Education requested that a thorough study be conducted in 1983-84 of all Masters programmes in communications being offered on the Island of Montreal. In the light of the present situation Dean Taddeo said that he had discussed the matter with the Department and had concluded that there were two choices: to do something on a part-time basis, or not to do anything and thereby give up by default the possibility of being one of those universities participating at the master's level in that area once the study has been conducted. The decision taken was to offer the Master in Media Studies on a part-time basis only in 1982-83 from resources currently available within the Department. If there are no resources forthcoming in the years ahead, then the decision will have to be taken as to whether or not to continue the programme.

5. Report of the Arts and Science Faculty Council Committee of Registration and Course Change (ASFC 82-6-D2)

Provost Singer, recalling the situation last year at this time when a very lengthy debate took place on the Curriculum Task Force Report without a quorum present for the first hour and a half, asked that it be recorded that there was a quorum present for this debate.

Prof. Ginter was asked to present the Report of the Arts and Science Committee on Registration and Course Change to Council. He thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to present the report before the Council and to thank the other members of the committee for undertaking a very arduous commitment of time at a rather awkward period of the year. He explained that the objective of the committee was not only to present their recommendations to Council, but to present a series of what they considered to be the most realistic options within a range of options that they thought ought to be brought before

Council, to present the merits and demerits of each of these options and to engage within the report in a discussion which essentially begins and attempts to digest what the committee thought the principle elements of the debate ought to be, and then to leave it to Council to decide from among those options.

In presenting the report Prof. Ginter began by reiterating three distinctions made in it which he hoped would be important in the debate to take place: 1) that there is a real distinction to be made between advising and record processing - the committee's mandate did not include advising as such - it addressed itself to structures in record processing and within the report tried to illustrate the flexibility or inflexibility of the various structures with respect to advising; 2) the distinction between policy and structure - the former is not addressed in the report; again the committee tried to recommend structures which are maximally flexible for policy implementation; 3) the term 'advising' as employed in the context of the report refers to course selection advising rather than the broader functions of academic advising. Prof. Ginter stressed that he thought that it was most important to understand the precise function of the present system before deciding on any alternative; to appreciate the labour intensive activity that goes into the present system by comparison with alternatives investigated. Prof. Ginter then explained in detail some of the procedures outlined in the report.

Prof. Ginter answered questions from the floor.

In reply to the question of how long it would take to make the transition to an on-line system, Prof. Ginter estimated that it would take two years, that if full approval is secured within the next month or so, phasing in full implementation could occur by March of 1984 with a partial implementation taking place by August 1983 at which point the whole system would have to be de-bugged and the fine tuning done.

Prof. Lightstone thought that there were three issues to be debated: 1) whether to put into effect a decentralized on-line system as a long-term solution; 2) whether the short-term solution is to fine-tune what we have or to adopt some other procedure in what seems to be a two-year period; 3) whether to opt for fine-tuning of the system in place.

Prof. Ginter agreed and said that in fact the final recommendations of the committee were structured almost precisely in that fashion.

Recommendations

82-6-2 It was moved and seconded (Megann/Langford) to approve Recommendations 1-10 as outlined in the report starting on page 74.

Prof. Ginter suggested that the recommendations be understood by Council not so much in terms of the fine detail as listed in the

Report, but rather as an endorsement of the structures and principles with the understanding that some latitude must be left to the implementation committee to work out the fine details. This is what the committee intended and why the word 'endorse' was used in presenting the recommendations to Council.

82-6-3 It was moved and seconded (Megann/Méthot) to approve Recommendation 1.
Vote: Carried

82-6-4 It was moved and seconded (Lightstone/Méthot) to approve Recommendation 2.

Provost Singer asked if it had been decided which administrator was to serve on the committee. He said that he had asked the question because he feared that it will be the Assistant Dean responsible for Student Affairs, who only two weeks ago was saddled with the responsibility for academic advising. He said he could not understand how it could be anyone else and yet he could not see how anyone will ever be able to do such a massive job.

Prof. Drysdale replied that he thought that the principle ought to be that it be an administrator, then Steering Committee can make a recommendation.

Provost Singer said he had no difficulty with going that route except that Recommendation 4 states that this group will make recommendations on procedures and policies, and if the latter is also intended, then there would be a cross-over from one area to another which would necessarily involve the person who is making these kinds of decisions; in which case he was not certain that it should specifically state that there has to be an administrator included on the committee. He then asked if it was necessary to specify the composition of the committee at this point.

Dean Taddeo replied that what he thought had been attempted in this recommendation was to assure a follow-up to the work that had already been done. He agreed that the Assistant Dean responsible for Student Affairs and academic advising will have to be kept up-to-date on any decisions regarding policy, but what he thought really important was to assure that the University as a whole decide soon to move ahead and he thought that was the thrust of this recommendation.

Ms. Megann suggested that the recommendation should state "that Council appoint a committee consisting of one member of faculty, one administrator and one student". It was so agreed.

84-6-5 It was moved and seconded (Macaluse/McEvenue) to name Prof. Ginter as the faculty member on the committee and Dean Taddeo as the administrator, and to charge CUSA with naming the student member.

Provost Singer spoke against the motion because he insisted on the need for close co-ordination between the implementation of the academic advising system which Faculty Council had approved at its last meeting and the implementation of this registration report. He thought it might be premature to decide now who is to sit on the committee, at least from the administrative side, and reminded

Council that it had determined that the person who is to be responsible for academic advising is to be appointed by June 1, 1982. Until that is decided he would like the naming of the administrator put off.

A vote was taken on those in favour of calling the question on Recommendation 2 as amended, excluding the names of the members and was carried.

The question was called on the approval of Recommendation 2 as amended and was carried.

Prof. Macaluso repeated his motion on the membership of the committee.

It was asked if there ought not to be a representative from the Registrar's office on the committee. It was pointed out that this committee's role was to oversee the implementation of registration and course change procedures and that it will not be responsible for the implementation.

Prof. Ginter explained that there is already a consultative committee between the Registrar's office and the support group which engages in planning the student data file and that the committee to be appointed by Council would simply be mandated to co-operate with them in a consultative way in the development of that system, specifically with a view to early implementation to registration and course change. The goal is to bring faculty and administration and students into a regular and orderly collaboration in the whole process of registration and course change and student data file management. The intent is that if other faculties also go on-line then the committee of this Faculty would become, perhaps a component of an extended committee that would report to this Faculty on matters peculiar to this Faculty.

Dean Taddeo asked that his name be withdrawn from the slate proposed by Prof. Macaluso, and suggested that the appointment of the administrator be made in September.

Prof. Macaluso agreed to amend his motion accordingly. The question was called on the motion as amended and was carried.

- 82-6-6 It was moved and seconded (Sahni/Langford) to approve Recommendation 3.
Vote: Carried
- 82-6-7 It was moved and seconded (Pallen/Langford) to approve Recommendation 4.
- 82-6-8 It was moved and seconded (Kalman/Shames) that the committee be named Policy and Procedures Committee instead of Liason Committee.
Vote: Carried

Prof. Langford voiced his dissatisfaction with the wording of the recommendation saying that as stated it refers to an advising committee and he felt that it should be give some effective decision-making power.

82-6-9

Mr. Méthot moved to amend Recommendation 4 to read "such committee to be charged with review, development and implementation of registration and student data file".

Prof. Ginter said that he was sympathetic to the policy making notion but would like to give some idea of the complexity of the matter. He explained that the student data system currently is also, and will continue to be, of the most central importance to the office of institutional research and of planning. It is one of their principal data systems. He pointed to the fact that the second inadequacy of the current system is the impediment for higher level analytical functions to the extent that there are various analytical functions that cannot be performed. There are questions of structuring priorities that are not only suitable to the use that registration and course change would make of such a system but also the use that would be made of such a system by other administrative sectors of the University. As a result Prof. Ginter could not envisage a committee coming out of Senate which would have exclusive control of such a policy. It would have to work with and in collaboration with other groups. He was leery of overspecifying exclusive authority at this time.

It was agreed that an indication of some element of authority should be included in the recommendation. Mr. Méthot's amendment was withdrawn.

The question was called on the amendment. A vote was taken on those in favour of calling the question on the amendment and was carried.

The question was called on the amendment and was carried.

The question was called on approving Recommendation 4 as amended and was carried.

82-6-10

It was moved and seconded (Petrie/Pallen) to approve Recommendation 5.

Prof. Ginter, in presenting this recommendation to Council, noted that further modifications had been proposed by his committee and that the approval of this recommendation was subject to the acceptance of Recommendation 5.

The question was called by Prof. Lightstone.

A vote was taken on those in favour of calling the question and it was carried.

A vote was taken on the approval of Recommendation 5 and was carried.

82-6-11

It was moved and seconded (Pallen/Langford) to approve Recommendation 6.

Prof. Proppe asked why it was necessary for Commerce course change

to take place on the Loyola Campus, an arrangement which caused problems for the Mathematics Department.

He was told that it was because there was insufficient room on the downtown campus to accomodate both groups. Further, from the standpoint of the Arts and Science Faculty, not necessarily only in course change, but in some of the policies adopted by Commerce where they don't allow certain kinds of course changes and under certain other conditions Commerce creates a far larger crush than course changes in Arts and Science, and for that reason it is in our interest to keep the two groups separate.

- 82-6-12 It was moved by Professor Petrie that there be a reduction made in the preregistration fee (currently \$50) and that it be paid immediately upon completion of preregistration.

It was agreed that the recommendation should go forward to Senate without calling for a formal motion on the matter.

The question was called on the approval of Recommendation 6 and was carried.

- 82-6-13 It was moved and seconded (Petrie/Pallen) to approve Recommendation 7.

It was asked if this recommendation had been discussed with the Registrar. Prof. Ginter replied that the only thing that had been discussed with the Registrar where there seemed to be a substantial difference in view was whether the appointment cards would be issued in 15-minute intervals or alternatively be issued in two-hour blocks. His point of view was that if they are issued in large blocks a line-up would occur outside H-110.

It was suggested that there be some attempt to regulate the flow of students not only by adjusting the time blocks but also by department affiliation in order to avoid the possibility of a large number of students from one department appearing at the same time.

The question was called on the approval of Recommendation 7 and was carried.

- 2-6-14 It was moved and seconded (Sahni/Petrie) to approve Recommendation 8.

Mr. Princz, the Librarian's representative, stated that he did not think that Recommendations 8 and 9 should be considered by this Council because they deal with the use of space that belongs to the Library. Further the space might not be available within a very short time.

Referring to H-437 Prof. Ginter said that it was a large space containing older science journals on open stacks and was in the 90 percentile study area. It is essentially a study hall in its actual use pattern. It would be possible, during registration, to reserve

a portion of the room for library only use if that were deemed desirable. He went on to say that Council did not have the authority to use that space on its own initiative, all that was being asked for was an endorsement of the desirability of gaining access to that room for a limited period of time.

Ms. Megann asked for an explanation of the use of the term 'CUSA monitors'.

Prof. Ginter replied that it had been suggested to his committee by one of the CUSA past presidents that CUSA would be interested in participating in the process, perhaps in utilizing some of their own funds, with matching funds, without prejudging what those functions could be.

Prof. Baldwin raised the problem of adequate effective means of communication between the two course change areas.

Mr. Princz mentioned that the government had recognized the need for some additional library space even before the new library building is put up and that the government may not be in agreement to having some of the existing space being put to other use.

Provost Singer drew attention to the fact that Recommendation 9 is somewhat different from the other recommendations in that in recommendations 1-7 we are being asked to approve recommendations in general terms with the particulars to be worked out later, but in the case of Recommendation 9 we are dealing with the particular and what becomes very clear, given the comments of the Librarian's representative is that there are aspects of this that have to be considered further. He suggested that Recommendation 8 be approved now and that Recommendation 9 be eliminated.

The question was called on the motion to approve Recommendation 8 and was carried.

82-6-15 It was moved and seconded (Ryan/Megann) to approve Recommendation 9.

Prof. Langford concurred with Prof. Singer's remarks and added that he saw no reason why the space should not be used for a short period of time.

Provost Singer stated that if the recommendation remained as written he would vote against the motion because that while he respected the opinions of Profs. Langford and Kalman, he did not regard that as the adequate consultation that the Council needs prior to making such a recommendation.

The question was called by Prof. Lightstone.

A vote was taken on those in favour of calling the question and it was carried.

The question was called on the motion to approve Recommendation 9 and was carried.

82-6-16 It was moved and seconded (Méthot/Pallen) to approve Recommendation 10.

It was agreed that the recommendation be reworded to "that the committee referred to in Recommendation 2 also be charged with....."

The question was called on the approval of Recommendation 10 and was carried.

The question was called of the approval of the Report on Registration and Course Change as amended and was carried.

On behalf of Council Dean Taddeo thanked Profs. Carter and Roy, Jim Griffin and Francesca Worrall, and Prof. Ginter for having prepared so comprehensive a report for Council.

A loud round of applause followed.

The meeting was recessed for lunch.

Afternoon Session

The Chairman noted that there was a quorum present.

6. Report of the College Evaluation Committee on the Centre for Mature Students (ASFC 82-5-D2,D2A)

Briefly, Provost Singer reminded Council that at the last meeting the report of the College Evaluation Committee on the Simone de Beauvoir Institute was approved, but that the College Evaluation report on the Centre for Mature Students was not considered because of the procedural question of obtaining the response of the Centre to the report. Turning immediately to document ASFC 82-5-D2A Provost Singer explained that the document contained three sections: the introductory section describing the history of the unit; a section on procedures; and a list of 16 recommendations that can be taken in two parts: 1) the most serious recommendation that Senate mandated to the committee to make in the first instance, that of the recommendation on continuation, termination or modification of the unit. He said that the recommendation of the College Evaluation Committee is that the Centre for Mature Students be maintained but with modifications. Recommendations 2-12 can then be seen as flowing from that recommendation; they are the modifications that the committee suggests. Recommendations 13-16 are very different in nature, they stem from the Committee's reaction to the incredible student response as well as some faculty, to the Committee's evaluation form. Something like 400 written responses were received (about a 25% response rate) and most made responses not only about the Mature Student Centre, but about the programme and those comments are reflected to some extent in recommendations 13-16.

Provost Singer pointed to the typographical error in Recommendation 15, the omission of the word B. A. in the statement that "all B. A. mature students must take six of their 18 credits in English" He noted that this requirement does not apply to B. Sc. students.

Provost Singer invited Prof. Diubaldo to present the reaction of the Centre for Mature Students to Council.

Prof. Duibaldo read the resolution which was passed at a meeting of the Fellows of the Centre for Mature Students held on April 26, 1982:

"The Centre for Mature Students has received and accepted the report of the College Evaluation Committee:

In addition, the Follows of the Centre requested that, in light of its deliberations, the following points be brought to the attention of Council and yourself:

1. That the working definition of mature students, as used by the Centre for Mature Students and in accordance with its founding document, includes not only those who are accepted into the mature Entry Programme, but also those adults who are fully qualified for admission to the University but who have been away from school and are now returning to continue their education.
2. That, in connection with items 13 to 16 which deal with curriculum, the Arts and Science Curriculum Committee should examine carefully the implications of these recommendations as they apply to Science programmes, as well as to Arts programmes, which have specific prerequisites."

Provost Singer's response to the resolution was that neither one of the qualifications from the Centre really affects the recommendations of the College Evaluation Committee report, it is merely in the way one interprets the recommendations and he saw no reason for there to be any kind of conflict between what was just read and the recommendations of the College Evaluation Committee.

82-6-17 It was moved and seconded (Singer/Sahni) to approve the report of the College Evaluation Committee on the Centre for Mature Students ASFC 82-5-D2A).

Prof. MacLeod pointed to the fact that Recommendations 13-16 have serious implications for the B. Sc. degree in that it requires more than eighteen credits for entry into the programme and if these credits were to become part of the B. Sc. the degree would be granted on the basis of sixty post-CEGEP credits.

Provost Singer replied that he recognized that as a serious problem and suggested that Recommendations 13-16 be sent to the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty for further examination of the implications of these recommendations.

- 82-6-18 It was moved and seconded (Singer/Megann) to forward Recommendations 13-16 to the Curriculum Committee for further examination with the clear understanding that it will report back to Council on its opinion. Vote: Carried

Asked for an explanation of Recommendation 10, Provost Singer said that there was no intended criticism of the incumbent in the Associate Director's position on the Loyola Campus except that the position itself violates the spirit and letter of what was approved by Senate and the Board of Governors.

It was agreed that the second half of the statement in Recommendation 10 be deleted. The recommendation as amended states "that the position of Associate Director of the Centre for Mature Students be reviewed in light of the provisions in the Senate-approved founding document.

The question was called on the motion to approve the report of the College Evaluation Committee on the Centre for Mature Students and was carried.

Provost Singer informed Council that it was his intention, probably sometime over the next three months, to meet with the Chairpersons of the other three evaluation committees to try to reach some consensus that might be recommended to Faculty Council as a result of the first year's experience. He reminded Council that it was its intention to go with these four different evaluation committees for one year only so prior to re-staffing the committees for the coming year he hoped to be able to elicit a report from that group.

7. Curriculum Committee Reports

- a) Report 32U - Undergraduate Curriculum Change Proposals 1983-84 (ASFC 82-6-D1)

Dean Taddeo invited Prof. Drysdale to present the reports to Council.

- 82-6-19 It was moved and seconded (Macaluso/Sahni) to approve Curriculum Committee Report 32U - Undergraduate Curriculum Change Proposals 1983-84.

In presenting the Report 32U to Council Prof. Drysdale noted that it had a number of addenda which he would refer to later. He reminded Councillors that the report as presented is a summary document regarding submissions that have come from the various departments and units of the Faculty and that the full dossier was available for inspection in Dean Taddeo's office on the Loyola Campus and in H-401 downtown.

Prof. Drysdale asked that ASFC 82-6-D1, addendum 2, labelled Library Studies be inserted in the report in the alphabetically appropriate place. Referring to the report on ESL/TESL (ASFC 82-6-D1, addendum). Prof. Drysdale requested that the page titled Teaching English as a Second Language - Change in Programme Require-

ments, as well as the page following, be deleted and to substitute the three-page document circulated in the meeting. He explained that the new material was the result of developments which were ongoing until the previous day.

Prof. Drysdale noted that the Curriculum Committee's Report included proposals for new programmes from the departments of Biology, Etudes françaises, and Geology. These would require approval of Senate at its May meeting, as would the modifications to the M. A. in Public Policy and Public Administration, the B. Ed. TESL programme changes, and the ESL curriculum changes, if these are to become effective immediately. With regard to budgetary implications Prof. Drysdale said that the range was from none to absolutely nominal therefore, he thought it unnecessary to stress budgetary implications in any particular submission.

- 82-6-20 It was moved and seconded (McDougall/Pallen) to approve the new programmes in Biological Sciences, Etudes françaises, and Geology.
Vote: Carried

- 82-6-21 It was moved and seconded (McDougall/Pallen) to approve the remainder of the Curriculum Changes outlined in Report 32U (excluding the Addendum to D1).

No amendments were made to the submissions from the departments of Modern Language and Linguistics, Library Studies, and Philosophy in Division I; Education, Geography, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology and Anthropology in Division II; Chemistry and Mathematics in Division III; and Lonergan University College, and the School of Community and Public Affairs in Division IV.

The question was called on the motion to approve the curriculum changes for the departments listed above and was carried.

Mr. Martin asked for a clarification of the notes which appeared on the bottom of the pages dealing with Adult Education. Prof. Drysdale was asked to sort out the problem with Mr. Martin.

Prof. Drysdale said that although the curriculum changes for Etudes françaises had been approved in the motion to approve the new programme in that department, he would like to draw attention now to a minor change which should have been made in the document. Under the Specialization - French/English Translation, page 10, Year III - the second entry should be changed to "3 credits chosen from FRAN C470³ or C471³ or English courses chosen in consultation with the translation advisor" The revision was accepted by Council.

The question was called on the motion and was carried.

b) Curriculum Change Proposals 1983-84 ESL/TESL (Addendum to ASFC82-6-D1)

- 82-6-22 It was moved and seconded (Shames/Macaluso) to approve the ESL/TESL Curriculum Changes.
Vote: Carried

It was left to Prof. Drysdale and Mr. Martin to clarify the statement in the document on those eligible to receive credit for ESL C100.

Prof. Broes reported that the English Department had revised their descriptions of English 205 and 206 to complement what had been submitted previously, but in the light of the revisions for ESL/TESL submitted to Council at this meeting (addendum to D1), and the new clientele that would be expected to register in English 205 and 206 as a result of this very recent change, he thought that his department might be interested in again revising the calendar copy.

- 82-6-23 It was moved and seconded (Shames/Macaluso) to charge Profs. Broes and Drysdale with revising the descriptions of English 205 and 206.
Vote: Carried

The question was called on the approval of Report 32U as amended and was carried.

c) Curriculum Committee 33U - (Discontinued) Joint Programmes

Prof. Drysdale asked to have an error in typing corrected on page 2, to strike the word "Discontinued" following the heading 31.004.

- 82-6-24 It was moved and seconded (Macaluso/Méthot) to approve Report 33U.
Vote: Carried

d) Curriculum Committee 34G - M. A. in Public Policy and Public Administration (Modification to the programme, Internship Option ASFC82-D4)

- 2-6-25 It was moved and seconded (Macaluso/Sahni) to approve Curriculum Committee's Report 34G - M.A. in Public Policy and Public Administration (Internship Option).

Prof. Drysdale explained that it was imperative that the Internship Option to the M. A. in Public Policy and Public Administration be approved at the May meeting of Senate in order to allow two students currently registered in the programme who would be eligible for the internship to begin the programme in June.

Prof. Decarie reported that he had been asked to come to the meeting to represent Prof. Bindon and the School of Community and Public Affairs with reference to this change, and to express the difficulties in the proposal as seen by the School. First, that Council some years ago approved the curriculum of SCPA which requires a very similar internship programme using much the same employer. He said that the reputation of the School effectively stands on the success of its internship programme and he did not know if this new proposal posed a threat to the SCPA programme or not, or to what extent there will be co-operation between the School of Community and Public Affairs and the Political Science Department because discussion of this had never taken place between the Political Science Department and SCPA. It came to their attention, largely by accident, only about a week earlier. Reluctantly, he asked Council to very carefully consider that it may be taking an action which may damage a programme it has already approved.

Prof. Ross said that he could not speak for Prof. Price who had conducted the very lengthy negotiations referred to by Prof. Drysdale,

but as Director of the programme he regretted that there had not been the kind of consultation that Prof. Decarie would have liked. He did not think however, that the interests of the School were jeopardized in any way, nor their internship programme. He indicated his willingness to consult on an ongoing basis in order to insure that no conflict should arise in the future.

Prof. Decarie suggested that the programme be approved on an interim basis with the Department of Political Science and the School of Community and Public Affairs to report back to Council in the Fall on their feeling on a more permanent arrangement.

Prof. Sahni spoke in favour of the programme being proposed saying that he could not see any conflict since it is a graduate level programme while the other is offered at the undergraduate level.

Prof. McEvenue thought it deplorable that the appropriate consultation had not taken place and recalled that his Department had been involved in a similar situation last year. He supported Prof. Decarie's recommendation.

Provost Singer informed Council that he had received a memorandum from Prof. Bindon, who was unfortunately unable to attend this meeting, which he wished to read into the record: "I was concerned to discover that Agenda Item 6 (d) for the meeting of the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science on May 7 involved discussion of a proposed internship component in the Department of Political Science's M.A. in Public Policy and Administration. In that I have never been consulted in this matter my understanding of the planned programme is vague; yet suggestions that it involves a relationship with the Québec government and the annual placement of a significant number of graduate students in Quebec City prompts me to voice some concern.

The nature of my disquietude relates to a number of issues. As the SCPA has in place an internship programme that is premised to some degree upon a relationship with the provincial government, I am confused that no one approached me for my ideas in the matter, let alone informed me that it was about to come forward for approval. We are working very hard to recognize the aims of the SCPA as stated in our Senate-approved founding document. The emergence of this post-graduate stage has serious implications for our programme. It could inhibit any possibility of our realizing these goals.

A further concern lies in the larger matter of uncritical duplication of programme elements. The allure of a stage is obvious to both teacher and student, and handled carefully can expand the educational experience to a great degree. However, if such programmes are instituted without consultation and discussion of the potential impact of competition in today's economic context, damage might well result.

In that I am unable to attend Friday's meeting, and in the absence of any prior consultation or information, I must request that you intercede in this matter. It may be that a tabling motion is in order, contingent upon further discussion of the matter between the SCPA and the Political Science Department. My concerns apply equally to the success of both programmes."

Provost Singer said it was his understanding that Prof. Bindon did not know that there are some students caught in the middle. He endorsed Prof. McEvenue's notion that this is not the first time that proper procedures have not been followed. He said that this year in SCPA there are 15 students working on internships, some of whom are placed with the Quebec Government, and all of the 80 students who will be in school in September will have to go through an internship at the end of their second year, so that there is going to be some competition between the two groups, whether undergraduate or graduate level will be irrelevant to most of the employers based on the kinds of internships we are getting. He said that his inclination was to move to table, but if some compromise could be worked out so that the two students would not be jeopardized, with the clear understanding that this is a very serious matter, then he would go along with the compromise with the understanding that there will be a report in the Fall. He thought that Prof. Bindon's remarks should be taken seriously.

Prof. Ross again emphasized that the distinction between the two levels of study is extremely important, that the placement of graduate students will be at a level completely different to that of students from SCPA. In essence two different kinds of internship programmes were involved and the similarities are, perhaps, only in name and should not be overdrawn.

Prof. McEvenue said that he wanted it made clear that this Council considers such consultation absolutely essential.

Prof. Doyle suggested that it was the responsibility of the Curriculum Committee to see that proper procedures were followed.

Prof. Drysdale clarified the steps that had been taken by his committee saying that it received this proposal approximately ten days ago, dealt with it at its meeting of May 2, and that the choice they had was one between not being able to accommodate the request at all or to do what they decided to do, to delegate one of their members, Prof. Decarie, to engage in consultation. He thought that Council was in a position to state as part of the motion that consultation is to be mandated and the units are to report to Council on the basis of that consultation.

Dean Taddeo reviewed the development of the M. A. in Public Policy and Public Administration.

- 82-6-26 Prof. Kalman moved to table the document. A vote was taken on the motion which resulted in a tie broken by the Chairman who voted against the motion Defeated.

The discussion proceeded.

- 82-6-27 It was moved and seconded (Ross/Singer) to refer the report back to the Curriculum Committee for consultation with the Departments concerned, with the understanding that it will be returned to Council on May 25. Vote: Carried

7. Elections (ASFC 82-6-D5)

Dean Taddeo asked to have the name of H. Ladd added to the list of nominations for one-year appointments to Senate.

Prof. Trudel drew attention to the fact that he was not a member of the Political Science department, but a member of the Chemistry Department and asked to have a correction made in the list of Senate members to be replaced.

- 82-6-29 It was moved and seconded (Doyle/Casey) to approve the slate of nominees proposed by Steering Committee (ASFC 82-6-D5).
Vote: Carried

Dean Taddeo called for additional nominations from the floor. There were none.

- 82-6-30 It was moved and seconded (Macaluso/Megann) to close nominations.
Vote: Carried

All members were elected by acclamation.

8. Report of the Core Curricula Study Group (ASFC 82-6-D6)

Prof. Scheinberg presented the Report of the Core Curricula Study Group to the Council.

- 82-6-31 It was moved and seconded (Sahni/McEvenue) to approve the report of the Core Curricula Study Group.

Provost Singer expressed his disappointment in the report due to the failure of the Committee to satisfy one of the key objects of its mandate. Recommendation 5.1 of the Special Task Force on Curriculum stipulated that a study group be established to investigate the possibility of introducing additional core curricula in the Faculty, and that the committee be instructed to consult with existing colleges that have core curriculum. He could see no reference in the document to indicate that the consultation had taken place, and he regretted that the committee had not taken advantage of that resource. He thought that an explanation was in order.

Prof. Schienberg replied that the committee did not feel that it had reached the proper stage for such consultation and had it been ready to table a document which recommended a core curriculum, the consultation would have taken place with the colleges. However, the committee was not unaware of the programmes in the colleges since two of its members were from the colleges. He regretted that the committee had been unable to reach the stage of tabling a core curriculum at this meeting.

Provost Singer thought that it was a question of differences in approach, one consultation at the end of the process as described by Prof. Scheinberg, and the other, consultation during the process and it was the latter approach which he thought should have been followed.

Prof. Doyle thought that the mandate lacked direction.

- 82-6-32 It was moved and seconded (Sahni/Ryan) to begin section (1) of the mandate of the Task Force on Core Curricula with "to consult all concerned and to study existing curricula in the Faculty of Arts and Science as well as alternate models....."
Vote: Carried
- 82-6-33 It was moved and seconded (Singer/Megann) to split the motion in order to vote on the mandate separately.
Vote: Carried
- 82-6-34 It was moved and seconded (Sahni/Ryan) to approve the mandate of the Task Force on Core Curricula as amended.
Vote: Carried
- 82-6-35 It was moved and seconded (Singer/Pallen) to include in the composition of the committee Prof. McEvenue as the representative of the colleges.
Vote: Carried

Mr. Méthot suggested that in accordance with the regulations the student representative should be named by CUSA, therefore, Ms. Richard's name should be removed.

Dean Taddeo reviewed the membership of the committee - the Asst. Dean (Curriculum), Prof. Scheinberg, Prof. Mulgrady, Prof. McEvenue, and a student to be named by CUSA.

Prof. Doyle suggested that the committee should be given to understand that it is to present a practical case for a core curriculum as part of its basic mandate.

Provost Singer was in agreement with the suggestion and asked that it be recorded in the minutes.

Ms. Megann asked why the Task Force was mandated to report to the Vice-Rector, not to Council. All agreed that the report should be submitted to Council.

The question was called on those in favour of the composition of the committee as modified and was carried.

Dean Taddeo thought that the committee should report to Council next February.

8. Other Business

Dean Taddeo said that he would be unable to attend the next meeting of Council, and thanked Councillors for their co-operation throughout the year.

Provost Singer, speaking for the members of Council, expressed appreciation for Dean Taddeo's efforts in stepping in when Dean Cohen departed unexpectedly. He moved a vote of thanks to Dean Taddeo.

A warm round of applause followed.

9. Next Meeting

Tuesday, May 25, 1982, 9:30 a.m.

10. Adjournment

82-6-36 The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m. (Sahni/Singer)